UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,675	04/06/2005	Inmaculada Carrion-Rodrigo	59643.00575	9277

32294   7590   06/15/2009
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE
14TH FLOOR
VIENNA, VA 22182-6212

EXAMINER
CHUNG, HOON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2416	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/520,675	CARRION-RODRIGO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HOON J. CHUNG	2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>April 08, 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>77-83,101-108 and 113</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>77-83,101-108,113</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>November 12, 2008</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment submitted on April 08, 2009 is entered by the examiner.

2.   Claims 57-76, 84-100 and 109-112 are cancelled.

3.   Claim 113 is added.

Priority

4.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No.

0216278.2, filed on July 12, 2002.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 12, 2008 is

in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information

disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed April 08, 2009 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose receiving a

first packet data protocol request, the packet data protocol request including an identity

of a preferred packet data protocol context.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant interprets "a selected packet

data protocol context" to be different from "a preferred packet data protocol context".

However, nowhere in claims 77, 101 and 113 does a limitation exists that discloses "a

selected packet data protocol context" being different from "a preferred packet data

protocol context". Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8.   Claim 113 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

possession of the claimed invention. The claim recites the limitation "a computer

readable medium comprising a computer program product that when executed causes a

processor to perform..." in lines 1-2. The specification does not clearly disclose any

computer readable media/ medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10.   Claims 77 – 79, 101 – 103, 106 and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being clearly anticipated by Sevanto et al. (WO 00/78080 A1, hereinafter Sevanto '080).

        Regarding claim 77, Sevanto '080 discloses a method (page 2, lines 3 – 6 of

Sevanto '080 disclose that setting up an active communication connection between a

mobile station and a network requires a PDP context has to be activated between the

mobile station and a GGSN), comprising:

        receiving a first packet data protocol request from a user equipment (figure 2a of

Sevanto '080 discloses a SGSN that receives the PDP request from the UE) at a first

network element (i.e. the SGSN) of a network (i.e. a fixed packet-switched network,

page 1, lines 9 – 10 of Sevanto '080),

the packet data protocol request including an identity of a preferred packet data

protocol context (page 7 lines 15 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose QoS that is requested

by the mobile station, in which the mobile station requests QoS based on the desired

characteristics of the service; page 6, lines 15-16 of Sevanto '080 disclose the UE

selecting Network Service Access Point Identifier, in which the NSAPI identifies the

PDP context to be activated within the network);

transmitting a second packet data protocol request from the first network element

(figure 2a of Sevanto '080 discloses the SGSN transmitting the PDP request to a

GGSN) to a second network element (i.e. the GGSN),

the second packet data protocol request including at least part of the first packet

data protocol request (page 7, line 37 – page 8, line 2 of Sevanto '080 disclose SGSN

transmitting a Create PDP Context Request message to a GGSN; a comparison of

figure 3a, a message between a mobile station and a SGSN, and figure 3b, a message

between the SGSN and a GGSN, of Sevanto '080 disclose that the message between

the SGSN and the GGSN includes a subset of the message between the mobile station

and the SGSN);

receiving from the second network element (page 9, lines 5-6 of Sevanto '080

disclose the GGSN sending a Create PDP Context Response message back to the

SGSN), information on a selected packet data protocol context for signaling traffic (page

8, line 33 – page 9, line 2 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN establishing a tunnel

based on the service attributes of the PDP Context Request message); and

confirming the selected packet data protocol context (page 9, lines 15 – 16 of

Sevanto '080 disclose the logical tunnel between the mobile station and the GGSN is

established using the **specific service** of the activated PDP context) to the user

equipment (page 9, lines 5 – 6 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN sending a Create

PDP Context Response message back to the SGSN; page 9, lines 11 – 13 of Sevanto

'080 disclose the SGSN sending a Activate PDP Context Accept message back to the

mobile station, based on the message received from the GGSN, to activate a context;

page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose a QoS Negotiated field, that can restrict

the QoS further than what was requested by the mobile station, therefore, the actual

accepted QoS must be sent to the mobile station, otherwise the mobile station will

expect a higher QoS than the allocated QoS).

Regarding claim 78, Sevanto '080 discloses the method of claim 77, wherein the

second packet data protocol request includes the identify of the preferred packet data

protocol context (page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN using the

QoS requested by the mobile station to determine the QoS for the connection),

wherein the second network element selects the packet data protocol context in

dependence on the preferred packet data protocol context (page 8, lines 14 – 17 of

Sevanto '080),

and the packet data protocol contexts supported by the network (page 8, lines 15

– 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN can restrict/negotiate QoS, which is stored in

the PDP context, due to the system being overloaded, therefore certain QoS cannot be

supported by the network).

Regarding claim 79, Sevanto '080 discloses the method of claim 77, wherein the

second packet data protocol request does not include the identity of the preferred

packet data protocol context (figure 3a and 3b of Sevanto '080 disclose QoS REQ. from

the SGSN and QoS NEG. from the GGSN, fields respectively, and the QoS NEG. field

contains the negotiated QoS data sent by the SSGN to the GGSN, which can be

different from the requested QoS by the mobile station),

wherein the second network element selects the packet data protocol context in

dependence on packet data protocol contexts (page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080

disclose the GGSN using the QoS requested by the mobile station to determine the

QoS for the connection)

supported by the network (page 8, lines 15 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the

GGSN can restrict/negotiate QoS, which is stored in the PDP context, due to the system

being overloaded, therefore certain QoS cannot be supported by the network).

Regarding claim 101, Sevanto '080 discloses an apparatus (i.e. SGSN; page 2,

lines 3 – 6 of Sevanto '080 disclose that setting up an active communication connection

between a mobile station and a network requires a PDP context has to be activated

between the mobile station and a GGSN), comprising:

a receiver configured to receive a first packet data protocol request from a user

equipment (figure 2a of Sevanto '080 discloses a SGSN that receives the PDP request

from the UE) at a first network element (i.e. the SGSN) <u>of a network</u> (i.e. a fixed packet-

switched network, page 1, lines 9-10 of Sevanto '080),

the first <u>packet data protocol</u> request including an identity of a preferred <u>packet</u>

<u>data protocol</u> context (page 7 lines 15 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose QoS that is

requested by the mobile station, in which the mobile station requests QoS based on the

desired characteristics of the service; page 6, lines 15-16 of Sevanto '080 disclose the

UE selecting Network Service Access Point Identifier, in which the NSAPI identifies the

PDP context to be activated within the network);

<u>a transmitter configured to transmit</u> a second <u>packet data protocol</u> request from

the first network element (figure 2a of Sevanto '080 discloses the SGSN transmitting the

PDP request to a GGSN) <u>to</u> a second network element (i.e. the GGSN),

the second <u>packet data protocol</u> request including at least part of the first <u>packet</u>

<u>data protocol</u> request (page 7, line 37 – page 8, line 2 of Sevanto '080 disclose SGSN

transmitting a Create PDP Context Request message to a GGSN; a comparison of

figure 3a, a message between a mobile station and a SGSN, and figure 3b, a message

between the SGSN and a GGSN, of Sevanto '080 disclose that the message between

the SGSN and the GGSN includes a subset of the message between the mobile station

and the SGSN);

<u>said receiver configured to receive from</u> the second network element (page 9,

lines 5-6 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN sending a Create PDP Context Response

message back to the SGSN) <u>information on a selected packet data protocol context</u>

(page 8, line 33 – page 9, line 2 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN establishing a

tunnel based on the service attributes of the PDP Context Request message) <u>for traffic</u>

<u>between the user equipment and the network (</u>page 9, lines 15 – 16 of Sevanto '080

disclose the logical tunnel between the mobile station and the GGSN is established<u>)</u>;

and

  <u>a</u> confirming <u>unit configured to confirm</u> the selected <u>packet data protocol</u> context

(page 9, lines 15 – 16 of Sevanto '080 disclose the logical tunnel between the mobile

station and the GGSN is established using the **specific service** of the activated PDP

context) to the user equipment (page 9, lines 5 – 6 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN

sending a Create PDP Context Response message back to the SGSN; page 9, lines 11

– 13 of Sevanto '080 disclose the SGSN sending a Activate PDP Context Accept

message back to the mobile station, based on the message received from the GGSN, to

activate a context; page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose a QoS Negotiated

field, that can restrict the QoS further than what was requested by the mobile station,

therefore, the actual accepted QoS must be sent to the mobile station, otherwise the

mobile station will expect a higher QoS than the allocated QoS).

  Regarding claim 102, Sevanto '080 discloses the <u>apparatus</u> of claim 101,

wherein the second <u>packet data protocol</u> request includes the identify of the preferred

<u>packet data protocol</u> context (page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN

using the QoS requested by the mobile station to determine the QoS for the

connection), <u>and</u>

  the <u>selected packet data protocol context is</u> dependent upon the preferred <u>packet</u>

<u>data protocol</u> context (page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080), and

the packet data protocol contexts supported by the network (page 8, lines 15 –

17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN can restrict/negotiate QoS, which is stored in the

PDP context, due to the system being overloaded, therefore certain QoS cannot be

supported by the network).

Regarding claim 103, Sevanto '080 discloses the apparatus of claim 102,

wherein the second packet data protocol request does not include the identity of the

preferred packet data protocol context (figure 3a and 3b of Sevanto '080 disclose QoS

REQ. from the SGSN and QoS NEG. from the GGSN, fields respectively, and the QoS

NEG. field contains the negotiated QoS data sent by the SSGN to the GGSN, which can

be different from the requested QoS by the mobile station),

wherein the selected packet data protocol context is selected in dependence on

packet data protocol contexts (page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN

using the QoS requested by the mobile station to determine the QoS for the connection)

supported by the network (page 8, lines 15 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose the

GGSN can restrict/negotiate QoS, which is stored in the PDP context, due to the system

being overloaded, therefore certain QoS cannot be supported by the network).

Regarding claim 106, Sevanto '080 discloses the apparatus of claim 101,

wherein the first network element is a serving general packet radio service support node

(page 6, lines 12 – 13 and figure 2a of Sevanto '080 disclose a mobile station

transmitting an Activate PDP Context Request message through SGSN), and

the second network element is a <u>gateway general packet radio service support</u>

<u>node</u> (page 7, line 37 – page 8, line 2 and figure 2a of Sevanto '080 disclose the SGSN

transmitting a Create PDP Context Request message to a GGSN).

Regarding claim 113, Sevanto '080 discloses a computer readable medium

comprising a computer program product (page 11, lines 20-21 of Sevanto '080 disclose

a memory in the form of machine readable processing instructions including

programming instructions) that when executed causes a processor (figure 4 of Sevanto

'080 discloses a control unit 423) to perform (page 2, lines 3 – 6 of Sevanto '080

disclose that setting up an active communication connection between a mobile station

and a network requires a PDP context has to be activated between the mobile station

and a GGSN):

receiving a first packet data protocol request from a user equipment (figure 2a of

Sevanto '080 discloses a SGSN that receives the PDP request from the UE) at a first

network element (i.e. the SGSN) of a network (i.e. a fixed packet-switched network,

page 1, lines 9 – 10 of Sevanto '080),

the packet data protocol request including an identity of a preferred packet data

protocol context (page 7 lines 15 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose QoS that is requested

by the mobile station, in which the mobile station requests QoS based on the desired

characteristics of the service; page 6, lines 15-16 of Sevanto '080 disclose the UE

selecting Network Service Access Point Identifier, in which the NSAPI identifies the

PDP context to be activated within the network);

transmitting a second packet data protocol request from the first network element

(figure 2a of Sevanto '080 discloses the SGSN transmitting the PDP request to a

GGSN) to a second network element (i.e. the GGSN),

the second packet data protocol request including at least part of the first packet

data protocol request (page 7, line 37 – page 8, line 2 of Sevanto '080 disclose SGSN

transmitting a Create PDP Context Request message to a GGSN; a comparison of

figure 3a, a message between a mobile station and a SGSN, and figure 3b, a message

between the SGSN and a GGSN, of Sevanto '080 disclose that the message between

the SGSN and the GGSN includes a subset of the message between the mobile station

and the SGSN);

receiving from the second network element (page 9, lines 5-6 of Sevanto '080

disclose the GGSN sending a Create PDP Context Response message back to the

SGSN), information on a selected packet data protocol context for signaling traffic (page

8, line 33 – page 9, line 2 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN establishing a tunnel

based on the service attributes of the PDP Context Request message); and

confirming the selected packet data protocol context (page 9, lines 15 – 16 of

Sevanto '080 disclose the logical tunnel between the mobile station and the GGSN is

established using the **specific service** of the activated PDP context) to the user

equipment (page 9, lines 5 – 6 of Sevanto '080 disclose the GGSN sending a Create

PDP Context Response message back to the SGSN; page 9, lines 11 – 13 of Sevanto

'080 disclose the SGSN sending a Activate PDP Context Accept message back to the

mobile station, based on the message received from the GGSN, to activate a context;

page 8, lines 14 – 17 of Sevanto '080 disclose a QoS Negotiated field, that can restrict

the QoS further than what was requested by the mobile station, therefore, the actual

accepted QoS must be sent to the mobile station, otherwise the mobile station will

expect a higher QoS than the allocated QoS).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 80 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sevanto et al. (WO 00/78080 A1, hereinafter Sevanto '080) in view of Le et al. (US

Patent No. 6,230,005 B1, hereinafter Le '005).

Regarding claim 80, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose the method of

claim 79, wherein the selected packet data protocol context is a default packet data

protocol context.

Le '005 discloses the selected packet data protocol context being a default

packet data protocol context (column 8, lines 35 – 37 of Le '005 disclose

activating/selecting a default PDP context, due to there being no means for the mobile

station to specify PDP contexts; claim 79 claims the second network element removing

the identify of the preferred PDP context, therefore, the mobile station cannot send the preferred PDP context to the second network element).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a default PDP context, since the modification, as suggested in column 2, lines 8 – 10 of Le '005, provides a method and a system for preserving second generation switching while providing post-second generation services (i.e. 3g).

Regarding claim 104, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose the apparatus of claim 103, wherein the selected packet data protocol context is a default packet data protocol context.

Le '005 discloses the selected packet data protocol context being a default packet data protocol context (column 8, lines 35 – 37 of Le '005 disclose activating/selecting a default PDP context, due to there being no means for the mobile station to specify PDP contexts; claim 79 claims the second network element removing the identify of the preferred PDP context, therefore, the mobile station cannot send the preferred PDP context to the second network element).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a default PDP context, since the modification, as suggested in column 2, lines 8 – 10 of Le '005, provides a method and a system for preserving second generation switching while providing post-second generation services (i.e. 3g).

13.   Claims 81 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sevanto et al. (WO 00/78080 A1, hereinafter Sevanto '080) in view of Chen (US

Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0053126 A1, hereinafter Chen '126).

Regarding claim 81, Sevanto '080 discloses the method of claim 78, wherein the

selected packet data protocol context includes a general purpose packet data protocol

context (page 6, lines 20 – 22 of Sevanto '080 disclose an IP PDP type).

However, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose selecting a dedicated

signaling packet data protocol context.

Chen '126 discloses selecting a dedicated signaling packet data protocol context

(page 1, paragraph 8 of Chen '126 discloses that existing protocols such as PDP

Context Activation procedure is a signaling protocol).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to select a signaling PDP context, since the

modification, as suggested in page 1, paragraph 11 of Chen '126, provides an

alternative method of reserving resources in third of future generations of wireless

mobile networks which has no or minimal impact on existing architecture.

Regarding claim 105, Sevanto '080 discloses the apparatus of claim 101,

wherein the selected packet data protocol context includes a general purpose packet

data protocol context (page 6, lines 20 – 22 of Sevanto '080 disclose an IP PDP type).

However, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose selecting a dedicated

signaling packet data protocol context.

Chen '126 discloses selecting a dedicated signaling <u>packet data protocol</u> context (page 1, paragraph 8 of Chen '126 discloses that existing protocols such as PDP Context Activation procedure is a signaling protocol).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a signaling PDP context, since the modification, as suggested in page 1, paragraph 11 of Chen '126, provides an alternative method of reserving resources in third of future generations of wireless mobile networks which has no or minimal impact on existing architecture.

14.   Claims 82 and 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevanto et al. (WO 00/78080 A1, hereinafter Sevanto '080) in view of Uskela et al. (WO 01/47179 A1, hereinafter Uskela '179).

Regarding claim 82, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 78, wherein the confirming comprises transmitting a cause code to the user equipment.

Uskela '179 discloses transmitting a cause code to the user equipment (page 10, lines 22 – 25 of Uskela '179 discloses transmitting a cause code to the mobile station).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit a cause code to a user equipment, since the modification, as suggested in page 2, lines 22 – 25 of Uskela '179, provides a method so that a receiver of a data packet can rely on the fact that the source address of the data packet indicates the real sender of the packet.

Regarding claim 107, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose the apparatus of

claim 106, wherein confirmation comprises a cause code to the user equipment.

Uskela '179 discloses transmitting a cause code to the user equipment (page 10,

lines 22 – 25 of Uskela '179 discloses transmitting a cause code to the mobile station).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to transmit a cause code to a user equipment, since

the modification, as suggested in page 2, lines 22 – 25 of Uskela '179, provides a

method so that a receiver of a data packet can rely on the fact that the source address

of the data packet indicates the real sender of the packet.

15.   Claims 83 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sevanto et al. (WO 00/78080 A1, hereinafter Sevanto '080) in view of Lindgren et

al. (US Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0002041 A1, hereinafter Lindgren '041).

Regarding claim 83, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose the method of

claim 77, wherein the preferred packet data protocol context is an emergency packet

data protocol context.

Lindgren '041 discloses a preferred packet data protocol context being an

emergency packet data protocol context (page 2, paragraph 30 of Lindgren '041

discloses the mobile station sending a PDP context request message, including an

emergency indication, to the SGSN).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to identify a communication request as being an

emergency connection request, since the modification, as suggested in page 1,

paragraph 1 of Lindgren '041, provides a telecommunications network using IP that

handles emergency calls.

Regarding claim 108, Sevanto '080 does not explicitly disclose the apparatus of

claim 101, wherein the preferred packet data protocol context is an emergency packet

data protocol context.

Lindgren '041 discloses a preferred packet data protocol context being an

emergency packet data protocol context (page 2, paragraph 30 of Lindgren '041

discloses the mobile station sending a PDP context request message, including an

emergency indication, to the SGSN).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to identify a communication request as being an

emergency connection request, since the modification, as suggested in page 1,

paragraph 1 of Lindgren '041, provides a telecommunications network using IP that

handles emergency calls.

Conclusion

16.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HOON J. CHUNG whose telephone number is

(571)272-4059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday,

8:00AM - 5:00PM, ALT. Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Aung Moe can be reached on (571)272-7314. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aung S. Moe/   /Hoon J Chung/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416   Examiner, Art Unit 2416
                                                        June 10, 2009